

Date: Mon, 1 Aug 94 04:30:14 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #340
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 1 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 340

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 31 Jul 1994 01:46:41 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <318of3\$3h6@chnews.intel.com>, <31931g\$6er@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<3195j6\$866@abyss.West.Sun.COM>
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <3195j6\$866@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana
Myers) writes:
>In article <31931g\$6er@nyx10.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard)
writes:
>>
>>Because it's a requirement. We, as a society, have gotten away from meeting
>>requirements in order to get privileges, and toward lowering requirements
>>instead.
>
>Uhh, Jay, do laws justify themselves? Why is CW currently a requirement?

Why not ask those who are responsible for that law instead of trying to
second guess their reasons for enacting and keeping such a law?

>>Used to be that if someone wanted something badly enough, he'd do what it took
>>to get it. Now he just whines about "relevance" and tries to get standards
>>lowered until he can get in with no work.

>

>Jay, you really can't fairly dismiss the relevance argument when it comes
>to the CW requirements. These requirements were at one time relevant,
>and I (and others) now question the relevance of the requirement. You're
>going to have to do a lot better than "Cause that's the way it is" in
>this discussion.

Again, ask those who keep that law on the books why they feel it's
relevant.

>Anyway, I'm always amused when the pro-code crowd uses the term "whine";
>sure, there are people that won't learn CW, want the requirement
>removed, and whine about it. However, the pro-code crowd seems to
>include a lot of folks that did learn CW, want the requirement retained,
>and whine about it.

The pro-code folks wouldn't even be discussing this issue if it weren't
for whines of a small group of people on here; we're only reacting to
their complaints.

My Oxford dictionary states that one of the uses of Whine is ``To
utter complaints...'', ``To cause to pass away...''. Neither of
those uses can be applied to the pro-code stance, for why would
we `utter complaints' about keeping the code, and what would we
want `to cause to pass away'?

Jeff NH6IL
jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #340
